



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

---

FEBRUARY, 1854.

---

## THE PEACE MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND.

---

**Abstract of the Proceedings at the Edinburgh Peace Conference.\***

---

### INTRODUCTORY STATEMENTS.

FEW among us are fully aware of the position which the Cause of Peace has already assumed in England. We cannot ourselves describe it so well as it is illustrated in the following pages, which we commend to the special notice of our own statesmen, our Christian ministers, and editors of the nearly three thousand periodicals in our country. The topics discussed, the information furnished, and the force of logic and eloquence displayed, as well as the high character and standing of the speakers, all concur in challenging, as they will certainly reward, the most respectful and earnest attention of all who take an interest in a question hardly second in importance to any one now before the world, and destined in due time to engage its leading minds, and to mould its permanent policy.

Every reader knows that the friends of Peace in both hemispheres have held, during the last ten years, a series of General Peace Conferences at London, and in several countries on the Continent. In imitation of those Congresses, our co workers in England have, within the past year, held two Peace Conferences — the first at Manchester, in January, and the second at Edinburgh, in October. The former, attended by nearly twenty members of Parliament, and some five hundred gentlemen of distinction from all parts of the United Kingdom, was designed to meet the imminent danger of a war with France, arising from the strange, almost incredible panic, which then prevailed, about a French invasion of England; and so completely successful was the demonstration, that the tide of opinion soon turned, and left scarcely a man in all the land willing to acknowledge he had ever believed a word of the silly and senseless delusion which seemed for a time to frighten nearly the whole nation into a phrenzy of fear and alarm. The Edinburgh

---

\*We have delayed the publication of this abstract in order to get the revised edition promised by our English friends.

Conference was convened to meet the crisis occasioned by the controversy still pending between Russia and Turkey ; and most of the following extracts from its proceedings will be found to have reference, more or less direct, to the attitude of affairs then existing on the Continent, and to the policy which Great Britain ought to pursue in this and similar cases.

It will here be seen how *practical* is the Cause of Peace. Its advocates, alike at Manchester and at Edinburgh, press every question to a present practical issue. They show it to be, not a mere abstraction, but a system of principles and measures well adapted to the real exigencies of the world. They grapple the actual difficulties before them, and tell how they might have been avoided, how they may now be alleviated, and how their recurrence hereafter may, in most, if not all cases, be prevented.

Indeed, the Peace Question is so practical as already to have reached no small degree of prominence and power in England ; and it is destined to become, sooner or later, the great central hinge of the world's politics. Such is its legitimate position ; and in time it must, like the sun in the heavens, range around itself all the chief interests of our race. There will ere long be, at least in the Old World, only two great parties — the Peace Party and the War Party ; the former the party of freedom and progress, the latter the party of despotism and reaction.

This cause is slowly yet surely becoming “a power on the earth.” Its strength in England is seen in the character of its champions, and the hold it has already attained upon the public. The speeches of no less than ten members of Parliament are pretty fully reported in the proceedings of the Edinburgh Conference ; and among them are some of the ablest and most influential men in all England, men who seldom undertake any thing without carrying it to a successful issue.

---

#### RECENT LABORS IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE.

STATEMENT BY REV. HENRY RICHARDS, SECRETARY OF THE LONDON PEACE SOCIETY.

MR. RICHARDS, having been called on by the Lord Provost, gave some account of the proceedings of the Committee since the last meeting at Manchester in January. At that time the public mind had been wrought into a paroxysm of anxiety and terror, owing to an apprehension that this country was to be invaded by our neighbors, the French. To counteract this groundless excitement, was the first object of the Committee ; and, with that view, they resolved on giving the widest possible circulation to the pamphlet written by Mr. Cobden at that time, called “1793 and 1853.” Accordingly they procured, in the first instance, a sufficient number to send a copy to almost every Literary and Mechanics’ Institute in the kingdom ; they then purchased 20,000 of a cheap edition issued by Mr. Ireland at Manchester, in addition to which, they published a cheap edition of their own, of which about 23,000 were issued ; and a recent edition, of a superior kind, designed for libraries, has been distributed pretty widely among gentlemen whom they are desirous to interest in the matter—mak-

ing a total of 47,900 put into circulation by the Peace Conference. Besides this, the different publishers have disposed of 38,000; and, as it appeared *in extenso* in the columns of the *Times*—which represents, it is said, a circulation of 40,000—it would seem that not fewer than 126,000 of that most able pamphlet has been distributed through the country. The Committee, also, prepared a large number of smaller tracts and pamphlets, showing the manifold evils, moral and financial, of war; and the total publications issued in furtherance of the movement throughout the country during the last nine months, is more than half a million.

But, besides this broad stream of peace literature, the Committee have also organized a series of public meetings, amounting in all to about 160, extending over all the principal towns of England and Wales, which have been visited by deputations from the Committee, and which have been attended many of them, by large and crowded audiences.

One of the matters left in charge of the Committee by the Manchester Conference, was the presentation of a memorial to the Prime Minister, in regard to the standing armies of Europe, and the wisdom and possibility of reducing them. This was presented on the 20th of February by a large deputation, including sixteen members of Parliament, and was received by Lord Aberdeen, not only most graciously and courteously, but with eminent favor. He expressed the most ardent desire for the attainment of the objects referred to, and said that by no other means could any Government more effectually promote the happiness of mankind. These opinions, he added, had not been recently adopted, but had been formed after a discussion ten years ago on the subject with his eminent friend Sir Robert Peel.

Another matter entrusted to the committee was to announce the proposal of a prize of £250 for the best, and £100 for the second best essay, either in the English, French, or German language, on the Standing Armaments of Europe. And having obtained the consent of the Chevalier Bunsen to appoint adjudicators, they had issued the notice in France, Belgium, and Germany, in which they had been greatly aided by Mr. Visschers, at Brussels, Mr. Varrentrapp, at Frankfort, and M. Garnier, in France.

They next received intelligence from America, that, certain treaties being under consideration for the settlement of the fishery question, their friends there had waited on the executive to suggest the insertion of a stipulation binding the two Governments, if any misunderstanding hereafter arose, to submit the matter in dispute to the judgment of an impartial but competent arbitrator. This proposal was received by the American Government with the utmost cordiality; \* and having waited on Lord Clarendon with the same object, his Lordship received them with great kindness, but asked, as it was a novelty in diplomacy, for further time to consider. These treaties are not yet completed; and I trust, that, when they are, it will be found such a clause has been inserted.

About two months ago Mr. Cobden, having had his attention called to the war in Burmah between the English and Burmese,—one of the most unrighteous ever undertaken by any country,—and having failed to obtain an opportunity to bring the subject before the House of Commons, brought it before the British public in the form of a pamphlet. I am happy to say the Committee have succeeded in selling five large editions, which I earnestly hope will rouse the opinion of this country against these wars of aggression and conquest which we are continually waging in India.

What the effect of our labors may have been during the nine months which have passed, it is impossible for me to say. The work is necessarily slow,

---

\*By the last administration; and, as the object is entirely aloof from all party issues, and common to the whole country alike, we trust it will be (if it has not already been) entertained with equal favor by the present Executive, into whose hands the negotiation passed of course.—ED.

and, like every one carried on by moral means, it is a slow *educational process*. But one thing is marked and manifest; a great change has been effected in the public opinion of this country on one point to which the labors of the Committee have been especially directed during the past few months—I mean the panic of French invasion. We can now say, I think, pretty confidently, that the panic is dead and buried—I hope never to obtain a resurrection. At the time we assembled in Manchester, we were overwhelmed with abuse because we dared to say that the alarm was false and unfounded; but now the propagators of the panic are as much ashamed of hearing it mentioned as Sir John Falstaff was of the men in buckram. There are now no rumors of Louis Napoleon contracting for war steamers at Glasgow, and that fabulous French frigate seen taking soundings along our coast has not been seen for some months. The man formerly branded as a bandit and robber, is now characterised as our excellent ally, whose faithfulness and loyalty cannot be exceeded. Of one thing the Committee are fully convinced. While aware of the difficulties and perplexities of a momentary kind from the passions of other nations, or their rulers, they rejoice that their course is clear; that the principles they hold, are the principles of unchangeable, everlasting obligation, and that it is their duty to go on proclaiming them. This they are resolved to do, whatever scorn may be poured on their efforts, confident that they must prevail, and that they are even now steadily advancing to a triumphant consummation.

#### THE LORD PROVOST.

**BASIS OF UNION IN THESE PEACE MOVEMENTS.**—I will endeavor to put our case in such a way that the public may understand for what purposes we are associated, and how far we are agreed. It is well known to many gentlemen here assembled, that we are associated for a common end, and that all the length we profess by our resolutions and our constitution to go, we go in perfect harmony, but that beyond these boundaries there are differences of opinion. The Peace Society consists of two sections—those who hold the principle that war in every form, and for every purpose, is unlawful, as being opposed to the precepts of Christianity, and to the whole spirit of the New Testament. Many members hold these principles broadly and strongly, and as unqualifiedly as it is possible to express them. Other members, again, do not hold these principles; but still they cordially concur with the first-mentioned class in deprecating the war spirit wherever it may be found, and in doing every thing in their power to repress it—thinking that the armaments, not only of this nation, but of all the nations of the world, are far too large, and that they lead to war inevitably from the great preparations which are made respecting it. Although these preparations are said to be for the preservation of peace, still we believe that, however good the intention of these preparations, they have the effect of fostering the war spirit. We believe that they lead to an enormous waste of national resources, in thus employing men for purposes which are not useful; and we agree in thinking that every thing in our power should be done to promote the opposite course, to repress the war spirit, to keep down these great armaments, and to act in such a just way that no nation in the world can have a good cause of quarrel against us. Then, above all, we hold that the great means of preventing war would be an arrangement made between nations, when they are in a friendly position towards each other, by getting clauses inserted in international treaties, providing that, if any dispute takes place which the parties cannot solve themselves, arbitrators shall be named in the treaties, to whom the questions shall be referred as they occur. In this way it is hoped that the feelings of bitterness and wounded pride, which often arise from very trifling incidents, and which are constantly blown upon by those who wish to propagate the war spirit, would

be nipped in the bud by being handed over to arbitrators, who would decide them as they arose.

Now, it must be quite plain to every candid and unbiassed mind, that there cannot be any inconsistency in these two sections acting together in so far as they are agreed. No principle is sacrificed by any one. Each member subscribes to all the opinions held by the Conference as a body; and these opinions must be judged of, like the opinions of all other associated bodies, not by the speeches either of the chairman, or individual members, but by the business done—by the opinions expressed in the resolutions which the Conference may adopt. Thus both sections of the Conference, as I understand, act entirely in unison, so far as the Conference expresses any opinion; and there is a very great deal to be done before we come to the point where we are likely to march off in different directions. There will be time enough to decide what is ultimately to be done, after the objects which I have placed before you shall have been accomplished.

We agree to differ on points on which all cannot agree, and to hold by those on which we are all agreed, and the matter is perfectly understood. But those who, like myself, do not go the length of the non-resisting principle, treat with the utmost possible respect, the opinions of those who do go that length; and to those who are disposed to treat their opinions lightly, and say it is not inconsistent with Christian principles to engage in war—to those who have not really examined the question—I would say that, if they would examine it fully, they would find it very difficult indeed to answer the arguments from Scripture which have been brought forward in support of that opinion. As for those who have studied the question, it would be of no use for me, or any one, to direct them on the subject; but if those who have not considered the question, would read a portion of the essays of Jonathan Dymond respecting war, they would see that it is much more easy to rail at these opinions than to answer them.

It has been said by our opponents, that we are met together for the purpose of attacking, or at least, that we are apt to attack, military and naval men. Now, certainly nothing of the kind can, with truth, be said of the objects of this Association. We all know that many able and excellent men have been employed in both branches of the service. Every man acquainted with the history of his country, knows this to be a fact. We are not assembled here to attack men, but to vindicate principles. We wish to say nothing that is personally offensive to any man whatever. Our object is to disseminate the principles which we hold, and to treat all courteously, and in that Christian spirit which we desire to see propagated throughout the world.

ENCOURAGEMENT TO EFFORT IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE.—The obloquy and sneers which follow the Peace Conference from certain quarters, I take very easy, because I know it is the fate of all growing causes to be sneered at when first started. Well do I recollect when, several years ago, I was enlisted in the Free-trade cause by my excellent friend Mr. Wigham, now present, with what ridicule, sneers, and contumely we were met by influential men of all parties. It was at first a little band; it began, however, to grow not only in numbers, but in zeal and ability, and you see now the result. The people who then said Free-trade was impossible, absurd, monstrous, and that it would ruin the country, and throw the land out of cultivation, were the loudest afterwards in praising the same thing under the more euphonious name of “unrestricted competition.” I venture to predict that, though success in this cause may not be so rapid,—I do not think myself it will be so rapid,—I have the most unbounded confidence that the principle will grow, and ultimately overcome all opposition. Believing, as I firmly do, in the Scriptures of truth, I am often amazed how men can appeal to the sacred records, and throw ridicule upon the present cause, when they re-

member that one of the prophecies there recorded, and which I for one most sincerely believe, is that the time will come when men shall learn the art of war no more. If men will learn the art of war no more, assuredly the cause of the Peace Conference will then be accomplished. I think that everything indicates the growing importance of this great cause; and I will just counsel our friends to follow the same course which was followed by the great confederation for free trade, which has proved such a blessing to this country, to go on perseveringly, in a straightforward manner, and determinedly, neither turning to the right hand nor the left, abusing nobody, going into no collateral question, but just holding right at it, and keeping it before the public mind. The public mind will in the end be enlightened, the members of Parliament will be enlightened, and give effect to the wishes of their constituencies. The Government of the day will give way, they will exercise their influence in this direction; and the influence which they will have on the other Governments of Europe will be such, that I have no doubt there are persons in this meeting who will live to see this cause all but triumphant.\*

PROF. McMICHAEL ON THE MILITARY PROFESSION AS UN-CHRISTIAN.

The resolution committed to my care has respect principally to the moral and religious aspect of the great question which has convened us here to day. And even with regard to this special characteristic, I must content myself with a single idea or two.

I have long been in the habit of looking upon war in connection with personal responsibility; and it appears to me that, were this subject contemplated in a thoughtful and prayerful spirit, it would put an end to the military profession as such. I bring no sweeping accusations against members of that profession. It is acknowledged, and acknowledged with thankfulness, that there are pious and devoted men in the army. May God increase their number a thousand fold! But this admission does not prevent me

---

\*THE PRINCIPAL RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED.

1. The first, after a preamble declaring "that recourse to arms for the settlement of international disputes, is a custom condemned alike by Christianity, Reason and Humanity," urges the special and solemn duty of all Christian Ministers, Parents, Instructors and Editors, to employ their great influence in promoting the cause of Peace among the mass of every people.

2. Asserts the duty of Governments, since an appeal to the sword can settle no question on any principle of equity and right, to adopt Stipulated Arbitration as a substitute for war, that is, a provision in their treaties for referring to the decision of arbitrators all difficulties that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by negotiation.

3. Urges the simultaneous reduction of standing armaments, as a prolific source of social immorality, financial embarrassment and national suffering, as exciting constant disquietude and irritation among the nations, and thus jeopardizing the continuance of Peace.

4. This Conference, believing that the intervention by threatened or actual violence, of one country in the internal politics of another, is a frequent cause of bitter and desolating wars, maintains that the right of every State to regulate its own affairs should be held absolute and inviolable, and that this country ought to abstain from entering into any Treaties or Alliances binding the Government to intervene by force of arms in the domestic concerns of any other people.

5. That the present system of governing India and the Colonies of this country, having a direct tendency to foster a military spirit, to encourage an extravagant military expenditure, and to involve the nation in a constant succession of dishonorable and cruel wars with the native races, eminently unfavorable to the true progress of religion, civilization, and commerce, this Conference is of opinion that the whole system ought to undergo a speedy and thorough revival.

6. Recommends as pioneers and auxiliaries to Peace, the promotion of cheap international postage, the general adoption of the same standard of weights, measures and coinage, the removal of commercial restrictions, and the assimilation of the mercantile laws and usages of all civilized nations.

from making the statement, that in my opinion the military profession is inconsistent with Christianity. Nor do I wish to cumber the argument by any allusion to defensive war, on which there is a diversity of sentiment by persons present, who have an equal abhorrence of the savage method of settling disputes with the sword. I am referring here to men who become soldiers as a means of procuring a living; who learn the art of war as other men learn the art of making shoes; and who acquire the skill to destroy human lives as the physician acquires the skill to save them. Our proposition is this—that no man is at liberty to embrace fighting as a trade, because he cannot do so without a total surrender as well of his moral as of his physical powers. He must relinquish all idea of direct responsibility to God. A soldier is a mere machine, a human instrument in the hands of his superior; he has no power over his own movements; he must obey all orders, and is reduced to the condition of a slave. The soldier and the Jesuit, much as they are opposed to each other in other respects, are here placed upon the same footing. Obedience without reason; blind, unthinking, passive obedience.

I am well aware that passive obedience is essential to military discipline. It cannot be dispensed with. Were the soldiers permitted to discuss the right and the wrong of a war in which they were to be engaged, it would be utterly destructive of the discipline of an army, it would defeat the very object for which it is organised. Obedience is the first, the middle, and the last lesson in the military school; and no small part of the training of a recruit is directed to break down his self-will, to make him conscious that his movements are all under the regulation of another, and that it is the duty of a soldier not to think, but to obey orders.

Now, the very necessity of this discipline is with me a reason, why no man, having a proper conception of his own dignity and responsibility, should enter a service where such tremendous moral sacrifices are required. Man is a personal being, and he has to do with a personal God. Man does not lose his individuality by becoming one of a corporation. The responsibility for his actions is not removed because he is an unit in a regiment. In the great and terrible day of the Lord, it will prove no sufficient apology for a work of murder, that the soldier had done it at the command of his superior, and that it was his duty implicitly to obey orders.

Let us take a particular instance; and to make it more conspicuous, let it be the case of an officer, and in that department of the service where most mind is required. The higher the rank, and the greater the intellect, the deeper becomes the degradation of passive obedience, the more desperate the criminality, and, alas! the more terrible the punishment. The officer, from our point of view, is worse than the private soldier. He has a better education, and he prostitutes his mind to the work of human destruction. Here is a person upon whom God has conferred the rare gift of a mathematical genius. If properly cultivated and directed, what an abundant source of pleasure to himself, and of benefit to mankind! It might be employed in the construction of railways by which the most distant parts of the world are brought into rapid communication with each other, and the prophecy of the ancient seer is realised, "and for stones they shall bring iron." It might be employed in flashing the trembling lightning across the wires of the electric telegraph, and thus making the glittering arrows of the Almighty a medium of intercourse between loving hearts, hundreds and thousands of miles apart. It might be employed in increasing the wondrous powers of the steam-engine; relieving man from many of his exhausting toils, and by its application to the printing press, sending light and knowledge to the farthest extremities of the earth. It might be employed in draining marshes, in supplying our towns and cities with water, and in adding to the comforts, the health and happiness of all classes of society. It might give us more

magnificent conceptions of the Divine Being by its discoveries in the far fields of space; and it might lay down rules derived from the starry heavens by which the mariner is guided through the wild waste of waters, so that in the darkest night he knows where he is, and how near he is to his desired haven. How noble, then, how useful is science, when thus directed! But, in the same proportion, how debasing does it become when directed to human destruction! It is as if a chemist were to make use of his knowledge, not to cure the diseases to which humanity is subject, but to poison the springs of existence. The scientific officer improves his mind, cultivates his rare endowments, augments his knowledge of the laws of nature, and for what purpose? That he may determine the precise direction at which these batteries may vomit forth their tempest of fire so as to destroy most property, and kill most lives. For what purpose? That he may calculate the precise angle and force with which these shells may be sent up in the air, that they may fall upon that particular dwelling which he knows is thronged with men, and exploding there, may send havoc and ruin among them. For what purpose? That he may determine the exact distance at which he may bring up the horse artillery so as to effect most destruction upon that square of soldiers, and pour forth the iron fire upon that compact phalanx of men, until so many breaches have been made in their ranks by the incessant cannonading, that the signal may now be given for the advance of the cavalry who are standing near impatient for the slaughter. The bugle sounds. They rush onward; they gallop in upon these broken footmen like a whirlwind, trample them down under the hoofs of their war-horses, and hew them down with their swords as grain before the reaper. Great God! am I at liberty to devote my faculties to this infernal work? Am I at liberty to improve my mental endowments to the highest possible point, and then to employ all the force of my genius to accomplish the work of human destruction? Am I at liberty, for certain pieces of money, to sell my educated talent to a ruler, to execute such deeds of atrocity against men who have done me no personal wrong, and who, it may be, are fighting for their dearest liberties? Was it for this purpose that God brought me into existence, stamped upon me his own image, and endowed me with amazing faculties? Have I a right to use these gifts to murder my own brethren, to send souls unprepared into eternity, and to bring down upon my head the curses of the widow and the orphan? And after I have done this fiendish work, can I lift up my heart to Him who is the father of the fatherless, and the husband of the widow, and say 'Lord I am not to blame for this horrid slaughter. I was only executing orders. I did no more than I was ordered to do by my commanding officer. I am not to blame.'

This pleading cannot be sustained. This Popish and military doctrine we utterly repudiate. It is condemned alike by reason and by Scripture. There is no transfer of personal responsibility—no commanding officer can take my place in the day of judgment, for the havoc and the ruin which I wrought at his orders. Every man must bear his own burden. Each one of us must give an account of himself unto God.

Let no man, then, who is conscious of possessing a moral and immortal nature, become a mercenary soldier. If war be a horrible necessity, let Christians have nothing to do with it. If it cannot be dispensed with, as is sometimes said, in the present condition of society, the blame rests with corrupt society, not with you. Let the potsherds of the earth contend with the potsherds of the earth; but woe to that man who contends with his Maker. At an entertainment which was given in London to Sir Harry Smith after his victories in India, that gallant officer declared that war is a damnable trade. My advice, then, to all is this, keep aloof from all damnable trades. Better to be a shoe-black, friend, than to be a soldier. Better be a chimney-sweep. Better be a street-sweeper. Shoes must be polished.

Chimneys must be swept. Streets must be cleaned. These are useful employments, and by consequence they are honorable. A man who is engaged in them is a laborer in the field of humanity, and he can pray with a good conscience that God may bless him in his work.

War, we are told, is a horrible necessity. Be it so: our object is to get rid of this horrible necessity. And how is this to be done? It is by the diffusion of sound principles. It is by the employment of those weapons which are not carnal, but which are mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds. It is by teaching men that they are children of the same father, and that theirs is a nobler destiny than to tear each other in pieces, like beasts devoid of reason, or fiends let loose from the bottomless pit. It is by stripping War of the tinsel and gaudy rags which have too long concealed her hideous form from view, and showing that behind her there follow Famine, and Pestilence, and Death. It is by binding all the members of the human family with the cords of an enlightened self-interest, and by proving, as we can do, that there is no such thing as an insulated and independent interest, but that the interest of one is the interest of all. It is by inculcating principles which will overthrow every throne, no matter how ancient and powerful, which is not based upon righteousness. It is, in one word, by the universal diffusion of an enlightened Christian public opinion on the blessings of peace, and the evils of war. Or, if you will, it is by making all mankind such as we are ourselves, the friends of peace. With an humbling sense of our own frailties and deficiencies in well-doing, it may still be affirmed that, when the sentiments of this large meeting meet with an universal reception, war becomes an impossibility.

And why should it not be so? Why should not the attempt be made? Is society in a sound state, when, at this moment, it is dependent upon the caprice of one man to let loose the dogs of war all over Europe, and a part of Asia, and to send to an untimely grave thousands of men, each of whom in God's sight is equal to himself? Is society in a sound state, when at all times the peace, the prosperity, and the enlightenment of Europe, are at the mercy of three or four crowned heads, who may be fools or knaves, simply and solely because they wear crowns on their heads? Is society in a sound state, when four millions of armed men are found in Europe alone, supported by the industry of those who work with head and hands, standing in the attitude of gladiators, ready to spring upon each other in deadly conflict whenever the word of command is issued? It is surely now more than time that nations should themselves interfere to put a stop to this expensive and brutalizing system, and declare with a voice of thunder that they will no longer consent to the wholesale slaughter of themselves or their friends, whenever their rulers are pleased to quarrel with each other.

Let every one, then, give his aid in this good work. Ministers can do much. Do you not long for the universal establishment of that kingdom which is love, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost? Parents can do much. What a sad heart would you have, should that fair boy of yours be butchered upon a battlefield, and his bright locks, dabbled in blood, thrown into a promiscuous trench? Other parents have hearts as tender and sensitive as your own. Instructors of youth, you can do much. You are enthusiasts in the cause of education. Whenever war raises her banners, dripping with human gore, mind sinks, and brute force gains the ascendant. Conductors of the public press, you can do much. If you are the friends of commerce, of reform, of cheap government, of human progress, you must be the friends of peace.

And let us be deterred by no opposition. We must be successful. All good men are with us. We have the sound hearts and the sound heads on our side. We have on our side the men who are accustomed to look difficulties in the face, boldly to grapple with them, and overcome them. We

have with us men who fought the battles of the slave; the men who fought the battles of Reform; the men who fought the battles of Free Trade; the men who began in a minority, but who ended with a majority. We have with us the men who always begin in the minority, and end in the majority. We can fight as valiantly and as perseveringly as ever, and assuredly the victory shall be ours. Yea, God himself is on our side. We catch his inspiration as we listen to the sweet music of the angel's song floating over the midnight plains of Bethlehem, "Glory to God in the highest; and on earth peace, good-will toward men." And in all our efforts to win the approving smile of the great Taskmaster, we are encouraged by the clear voice of prophecy ringing in our ears, "And they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

#### EXTRACTS FROM MR. COBDEN'S SPEECHES.

It is well that our friends have explained what are the peculiar objects, and what are the doctrines of this Association. My experience in past movements of a public kind teaches me this, that it is difficult, very difficult when you have got hold of a good cause, to bring its opponents to a fair and candid discussion of what you really mean. It is a great deal easier to misrepresent you, than to meet you, when you happen to be right; and therefore, instead of meeting us as we are, and opposing our objects such as we represent them to be, when we hold a meeting like this, our opponents raise the cry—"Oh! these are a set of fanatics, who, if the enemy were at our gates, would cry, 'Peace, peace;' these are the people who want us immediately to disband every soldier and every sailor that we have, and thus to invite the invasion of some foreign foe; these are the people who would lay us prostrate at the feet of the first horde of brigands who might choose to land upon our shores."

Now, I wish to make my profession of faith most distinctly with regard to this, and I shall do so very shortly. I don't believe that anybody is coming to attack us at all. I have never heard or read in modern history of anybody that meditated an attack upon our shores; I will hardly except even that of Napoleon the Great, because he came and took a look at us, and then turned away to a more inviting foe. But what my reading and experience have taught me is this; that the danger which the English people have to apprehend, arises from that peculiarity in their temperament, that idiosyncrasy of their nature—for nations have idiosyncracies as well as individuals—which leads us constantly to go and seek grounds of quarrel, and objects of hostility, even to the remotest parts of the globe. I have seen that, in past times, Englishmen have been successively fighting the battles of almost every people on the globe; but I have seen also that, whether the object of our intervention in these remote quarrels has been to advance the principles of civil and religious liberty, as I have sometimes heard it said, or to promote the progress of freer commercial intercourse—I have seen that our objects have steadily eluded our grasp; and the only result, almost the only practical result, which I have seen to this characteristic of our country, is this; that we have loaded ourselves with an amount of debt, greater than that of all the nations of the world besides, and that we are mistrusted, and not liked, by almost every nation in Christendom. Nor do I see that the spirit of later times has been very much changed for the better, for, if we cannot be persuaded to go and attack somebody else, then it seems to be equally easy to persuade us that somebody is coming to attack us.

Now, I beg it most emphatically to be understood that, when I attend these peace meetings, it is not that I wish to bow down our necks, and invite invaders to come amongst us. Nobody intends to invade you, nobody wants to invade you; the quarrels which you have had, the wars which you have

been engaged in, and the deb'ts which you have contracted have been all of your own seeking. And what I want now—and it was never more necessary than at the present moment—what I want now is this, to put a check, however feeble, on the tendency of a portion of the people of this country, who seem to be bent upon erecting into a maxim that which we have hitherto fancied only to apply to princes and despots,—that *peoples* learn nothing, and forget nothing. And when I speak of our people, I am not to draw down upon myself the taunt or rebuke which would place me in so disadvantageous a position, that I am appearing here, conscious that I am opposing the direct and settled opinions and convictions of the great mass of my countrymen. No; the great mass of our countrymen on this question are now standing, observing, and ready to hear and learn, and to be convinced. But I speak of men who, if we were not here, might take possession of the public mind; and, if they can represent the whole people, then the policy of the country must follow their dictates.

#### SUCCESS OF THE PEACE AGITATION IN ENGLAND.

I say we have seen lately that it is not difficult to persuade the English people that others are coming to attack them. I do not want to refer to what occurred six months ago, for the purpose of triumph or exultation. I have never alluded, as far as I am aware, in the House of Commons or elsewhere, to that most consummate triumph which this Conference has enjoyed in the change which has taken place since we last met in Manchester, on the subject of the French invasion. But it is necessary to allude to it now, because the very same pens are being dipped in venom to record the gibes and sneers at this Conference, which we had to encounter when we were in Manchester. And although I do not want to deprive them of the pleasure of abusing and capturing us, I think we have a fair right to ask the people of this country to estimate the force of the present attacks of those individuals by the value of their opinions just six months ago.

But what do we see, we who are denounced as the most credulous fools for presuming to say that the Emperor Napoleon did not meditate an invasion of our shores? What do we see now? The very minister who talked of the French coming from Cherbourg in one night with 60,000 men to invade our coasts, I myself heard say, that now the French and English were united, and had one common bond of interest, and were united by sentiments of mutual confidence and esteem; they were a power against which it was in vain for Russia to contend, for all Europe would be powerless against such an irresistible combination. And what did I hear at the end of the last session of Parliament in the Queen's speech, as if it was to give to the peace party the climax of our triumph? Not only does the Queen in her speech in Parliament, ere it separated, declare that she is on the best terms of amity with the French nation, but she rather goes out of the way to add that she is also on the best possible footing with the Emperor of the French.

Now, I have often thought of supposing the case of an individual who had been ordered away from his country, as many persons are for the benefit of their health, and supposing he had left our shores last January to take a voyage to Australia, returning again without remaining there, merely making the circuit of the globe for the benefit of his health. He left England preparing her militia, and fortifying her coasts, general officers writing to me offering to lay a wager that the French would come and invade us. And he saw our inspectors of cavalry and artillery moving about the southern coasts, deputations from the railway companies waiting upon the Admiralty and the Ordnance to see how soon the Commissariat and the Ordnance supplies could be transmitted from the Tower to Dover, or to Portsmouth. He left in the midst of all these preparations for the French invasion; he makes the circuit of the globe; and as he could see no newspaper,—for one great

motive in sending a careworn individual on such a voyage is to keep him away from politicians and the Post Office,—he knows nothing of what has occurred during his absence. Well, he lands here in September, and the first thing he reads of in the newspapers is, that the French and English fleets are lying side by side in Besika Bay. He immediately says that there is to be a great battle—he turns to the leading article of the very paper that had told him before he left the country that the French Emperor was a brigand and a pirate, and that the French people were about to invade England without notice or declaration of war—he turns to the leader in this paper—the very first he has seen after he has arrived in England—and there he finds that the English and French are so cordially united that their fleets are lying in Besika Bay, under the command of Admiral Dundas, that we are prepared, if necessary, to send an army to be put under a French general, and that we are going into action probably to-morrow, with the Russian fleet. Now, the first thing that he would naturally ask would be this,—but can you trust this individual whom, when I left Britain, you were characterizing as a brigand and a pirate? What has happened? Has anything happened to prove that these peace people have been right, and that you were wrong? What change has taken place? What does this mean? What guarantee has this man given you that, when you go into action with the Russian fleet, he has not previously come to an understanding with the Emperor of Russia, and that instead of joining you in firing broadsides into the Russian fleet, he will not join Russia in demolishing yours? And then, unless he has not undergone a great change,—and you have not explained to me how it happened,—what proofs have you that, when he has joined the Russian fleet in destroying yours, he will not come and ravage your coasts, burn down your houses, seize the Bank, and carry off the Queen?

Of all these things there is no explanation. I must confess, and I say it with the greatest regret, that my experience of late does not make me think more highly than I used to do of the statesmanship in this country; because if the men, having the conduct of our public affairs, were in earnest in what they told us nine months ago regarding this Government and this individual,—if they were in earnest, and not charlatans imposing on us from day to day,—how are they now justified in putting our ships alongside the ships of such a man? If they were not in earnest, then what sort of men have you got in power? I want to have their explanation about this. If I did not pity all those people who were attacking us nine months ago; if I were not, in the spirit of a friend of peace, to forget and forgive, I could not have had a greater triumph than to have brought down the papers, and read extracts from what they were saying when we met in Manchester, and anticipated what they are getting ready for us in two or three days to come. Why, don't you remember the caricature in which your humble servant was represented with very long ears, thus—(placing his hands to his head, amidst loud laughter)—because he stood up and declared, that he did not believe that the French were coming to invade us? Who has got the long ears and the fool's cap now?

THE PANIC IN ENGLAND OF A FRENCH INVASION THE OCCASION OF RUSSIA'S AGGRESSION ON TURKEY.—But more than that, I say that the position in which this country is at present placed, with reference to the Russian question, is distinctly to be traced to the conduct which these foolish people pursued nine months ago. I don't speak vaguely or idly. I speak from a knowledge short only of information from the first parties in these proceedings, when I say that what has been done in the East by the Emperor of Russia, was done from the deliberate calculation that it was impossible that France and England could unite to oppose him. We all know that it is an old and traditional policy of the Russian empire to encroach upon the dominions of the

Mahommedan people that are at their side. We know that that has been a maxim of State policy in Russia for the last hundred and fifty years. But we also know that the encroachments of Russia upon Turkey have been steadily resisted, not at times successfully, but still resisted by the combined action of the Western Powers of Europe, who have made it part of the State policy of Europe to oppose the aggrandisement of Russia in the East. The Russian Emperor saw not only in the public prints of this country, but he observed in the speeches of our statesmen in the House of Commons, the expression of an opinion, and feeling of mistrust and of horror of the character of the Sovereign of our next neighbor, France. He saw that in the House of Commons we had made provision for calling out the militia, avowedly in order to resist a French invasion; he heard men who, we are now told, were the very trustworthy peacemakers of this country—he heard these men, and I heard them myself, say, that in one single night, 60,000 French soldiers might come from Cherbourg, and land upon our shores; we were told that for us, the peace party, to assume for a moment the possibility that the Emperor of France was not a brigand and a pirate—to argue for a moment that the French people were not capable of coming and throwing themselves upon our shores, without any previous notice being given, without any declaration of war, without any cause of offence, like a party of buccaneers or pirates—to assume that such was not their natural course of action, argued that we were the most credulous and foolish fanatics in Britain. The Emperor of Russia heard and saw all this; and he naturally concluded, that it was utterly impossible that the French and English could unite again to join in one armament to resist his encroachments in the east of Europe. And his plans have been laid in the southern parts of Russia ever since last September or October; ever since this cry began they have been steadily pursued; as this foolish spirit of hostility to our neighbors the French came more and more to prevail in high quarters, they were the more determinedly persevered in; and now the consequence is that the Emperor of Russia has found, when it was too late, that those foolish people whom he mistook for the public opinion of England, have entirely misled him.

IGNORANCE RESPECTING TURKEY.—With regard to the condition of Turkey in Europe, and the condition of the Christian part of the population of European Turkey, why, our people, I should have thought, would have sympathised with the mass of the people in Turkey; but I find that all their sympathies go for the minority of the people—for that dominant class or caste who are oppressing the majority of the people of Turkey. Now, I don't say that this is any ground why we should go to war in order to remedy the evils which exist in Turkey. But I mean to say this, that if we are going to war, it is of all things necessary to know what we are going to do; otherwise we may incur all the expense which was incurred in the last French war, and you may end in totally failing to accomplish what you sought to effect. Now, I tell you from my knowledge of the Turkish empire, that not only all the king's horses and all the king's men, but all the horses and the men of all the kings and emperors in the world, cannot maintain the Mahommedan population of Turkey in Europe. There are seeds of decay and dissolution to be found which, in the very nature of things, you cannot combat against by fleets or armies.

I confess that I see with utter amazement the prevalent ignorance that exists in this country as to what they are going to fight about. They are going to fight to maintain Mahommedanism in Europe! But the precepts of the Koran are in opposition to the laws of nature, which are the laws of God; and the people who have the Koran for their law, cannot be perpetuated in Europe alongside of a Christian population. Why, you have in Turkey in Europe, three or four millions of Turks; and you have ten or twelve millions of Christians. I speak of what is generally admitted; because, as there

is no census of the people, one cannot speak with precise accuracy. Well, the Turks have been for four hundred years the dominant race; they have had all the power in the country; they have administered the laws; they are the sole part of the population that has been armed. The Christians have been treated like dogs—and are called dogs; they have no social status whatever; the Koran acknowledges no relation between the Mahommedan conquerors and the Christians, but that of master and slave; either kill them, or make them pay tribute, is the distinct law of the Koran. Up to this moment, there is no relationship between the Mahommedan governors and the Christian subjects, than that which I have described. Well, in spite of all that, what is the state of matters at this moment? The Turks are a decaying people; as Lamartine said,—and if any man is favorable to them, it is Lamartine—"Turkey is perishing for want of Turks." Well, notwithstanding all these advantages, I say the Turks are a declining population, while the Christians are constantly increasing by their side. But not merely so, all the wealth, all the accumulation of wealth, all the enterprise, all the intelligence, all the progress, whether moral or material, belong to the Christian population of European Turkey. Now, you may hear of a superior governing an inferior race, as in the case of our own Indian empire; but that is only the case when the intelligence, the wealth, all the real progress of a country, all the resources of science, are on the side of the dominant race; but you never yet knew, and you never will know, a race perpetuating their rule over another where these conditions are all reversed, and where that race is the more ignorant, the least wealthy, the least enterprising, and altogether, in every respect by which you could mark the progress of power in a people, inferior to those whom they pretend to govern.

Well, this being the condition of things, the Emperor of Russia steps in, and he says, 'I intend to insure to these Christians in Turkey in Europe the same treatment—I intend to insure to these Christians under the authority of the Porte, the same treatment which Christians having the protection of the French Government have in Turkey.' That is what he asks; and England steps in, and France steps in, to resist this, and to advise the Sultan to oppose it, because they say Russia meditates some selfish and aggressive designs. That is very true; but let me tell you that the people of this world, that is, the unprivileged masses of all countries, have ever gained their privileges and franchises by being lifted up by some nobles, or by some tyrants of kings, who had sinister objects in trying to enlist their sympathies. They wanted to gain something out of them; and it was by catering for the sympathies of the millions by nobles and kings in this country, that the masses of the people were lifted from their serfdom into citizenship. No doubt, the Emperor of Russia has the same sinister object in view. He wishes to establish an *imperium in imperio* in Turkey; and I have not the least doubt that he will succeed. I speak with great diffidence, because I do not think that anybody not there on the spot, and having the best opportunities of knowing what is the condition of things there, is capable of speaking with authority; but from all I can learn it is this,—Christians are glad to get increased and improved toleration and security against Mussulman wrong and violence, be it by the intervention of Russia or anybody else. Take one fact which has transpired. It has come out that, until Russia made this interference, the Christian population of Turkey in Europe could not give evidence in a court of law against a Mussulman for murder or theft, or any one who committed any act of violence, either in the family, or on the persons or property of any of them. That is a state of society worse than even negro slavery in America. But we are told, that since the intervention by Russia, an edict has been emitted from the Sultan, giving to the Christians the right to give evidence against a Mussulman in a court of

law. Does anybody doubt that the Christians will attribute this great boon they have received—a boon which, for the first time for four centuries, gives them the rights of citizenship—to the intervention of the Emperor of Russia?

My opinion is, that from the first there has been a great mistake in this matter. If we intended to interfere, we should have done what I believe we shall come to do yet. We should have joined Russia in insisting on the fullest religious liberty and perfect social equality for the great majority of Christians in Turkey in Europe; that is, if we interfere at all, for my opinions are too well known to render it possible for me to disguise them. What I would say is, leave them to themselves; but if you interfere in any way at all, the only practical way in which you could hope to accomplish any good is, to join with Russia, as you have joined with her when she was not one whit more sincere than now, in obtaining those rights and franchises which the Christian people of Turkey demand.

#### NO GOOD REASON WHY ENGLAND SHOULD GO TO WAR FOR TURKEY.

Are we called upon to exercise vengeance upon Russia, because Russia encroaches on Mahommedan power in Europe? Why, we have ourselves the Great Mogul—a Mahommedan sovereign—who ruled over three times the dominion of the Sultan, divested of his authority, and shut up as a puppet in Delhi. We have trampled down an empire in Burmah, and with as little ceremony, as little reason and justice, as a ruffian would go into the market place, and kick down an apple stall. Are we who do these things in the face of the world, to exercise God's vengeance on any other country for doing the same things? No! That is not a ground we can take up. I hope there is not hypocrisy enough extant to say we are bound to go to war to prevent injustice to the Mahommedans in Europe, when we have done far worse to Mahommedans where they are more at home—I mean in Asia.

But they say, it is because we have treaties with the Turks that we are going to fight their battles. I am just throwing these things before you; you will have plenty of time to consider them, as we are not going to have a fight on the Danube in the month of November. The opposing armies there will have to fight, not with one another, but with pestilence, and swamp, and cold, and starvation, and fever: they will be too much occupied with these grim monsters to contend against each other. You are not going to fight for treaties; you have no treaties to fight about. Look into any of these newspapers that are raising the war-cry, and calling for the fulfilment of our treaties with Turkey. They do not know but what we have a treaty which binds us to fight for the maintenance of Turkey,—that is, to keep the lines on the map the same as they now are, though I hardly know anybody who knows what the bounds of Turkey are. The thing is an absurdity. We have no such treaty with Turkey. There have been settlements from time to time, as that in which Turkey called on France and England to rescue her from the Pasha of Egypt in 1840. Then there were certain conditions made defining how the Pasha of Egypt should have Egypt hereditary in his family; and there are other treaties of a similar kind to which we were parties. But we are not bound by any treaty to defend the integrity of the Turkish empire. If America were to take Turkey to-morrow—if she were to take possession of Asia Minor, and keep it for her debt, we are not bound to go to war with America. And so in regard to other arguments we have heard. We are not bound in any way to be parties to anything that may happen in Turkey. We are not bound to interfere either externally or internally. We are bound not to violate the treaties we have made, by upsetting the settlement which we have been parties to; but we are not bound to fight to preserve those territorial arrangements, if other people choose to interfere with them. It has been settled with regard to the greatest territorial treaty that was ever entered into—the treaty of Vienna, by

which the whole boundaries of Europe were defined—it has been settled by the Earl of Aberdeen and the Duke of Wellington, by the Whig party, and all who were parties to it, that while we are bound not to violate that treaty, we are not bound to go to war to maintain the integrity of the countries whose boundaries were fixed by that treaty. Therefore, if you hear anybody filling up a phrase about a treaty, ask him to tell you where that treaty is, the date of it, and where to find it. And so it is in regard to the word “ally.” We are bound to go to war to defend our ancient ally! We have had more alliances with Russia than with Turkey, and we are not bound by any treaties whatever to maintain Turkey, any more than to maintain Tuscany, or Holland, or any other power. Divest the question of these points that touch the honor of the nation, and then you bring it to what it really is, —to a question of self-interest.

**NOT THE INTEREST OF ENGLAND TO GO TO WAR FOR TURKEY.**—The most effective part of the debates at the Edinburgh Conference had such constant and minute reference to local issues, that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for us in America to understand their exact force; but we will give in addition to what we have already quoted, a few specimens in the following portion of Mr. Cobden’s arguments against England’s going to war for Turkey.

I will now say a few words upon the interest which England has in the matter. I yesterday repudiated the idea altogether, that we are in a position to exercise God’s vengeance against Russia for doing an act of injustice and wrong to Turkey. I say we don’t come into this court of national judicature with clean hands—I say that for us to call public meetings, and to pass such resolutions as I have seen passed at Leicester and elsewhere, with our hands reeking with the blood of the Burmese at this moment—I say that, to talk of our being so indignant that we cannot remain in our beds because Russia is doing something not quite so illogical as Lord Dalhousie and Commodore Lambert did to the Burmese—I say, that for us to pretend to exercise God’s vengeance on other nations of the world, is presumption, and it is hypocrisy. And, therefore, whilst condemning—for I won’t be misunderstood in that matter—whilst condemning these acts as acts of wrong and injustice as between the Government of Russia and the Government of Turkey, whilst reprobating that conduct as illogical, and base, and mean, and tricky, I say we are not the parties who are called on to exercise vengeance on the authors of these wrongs.

And now I come to what, after all, is the only question with us—Is it our interest to go to war with Russia in consequence of the encroachments and acts of injustice which Russia is practising towards Turkey? Mind you, I don’t myself set up the argument of interest. No; that argument is set up by our opponents; and they compel me to deal with it in a pounds-shillings-and pence way. What is the argument then? They say that, if Russia comes and makes encroachments on Turkey, and if we do not meet her and drive her back, she will, after she has finished with Turkey, immediately proceed to attack us. Well, what does that argument amount to? It amounts to this, that because you assume that Russia will beat Turkey, and take the Turkish territories, she will thus acquire an enormous power by means of that territory, and come to attack me, that I am to go to war at once to avoid what is sure to take place afterwards, if it is not stopped now.

Well, but I don’t admit all these things. In the first place, I don’t admit that the acquisition of territory necessarily adds to the power of a State. I have visited just enough of these two countries to be able to read and understand what may be written about them, and that is about all that an active man of the world can expect to do with reference to any country. But I

confess, from all I know about these two countries, that Russia has enough to do in encouraging her commerce, extending her railroads, deepening her rivers, widening her ports and channels, and in facilitating intercourse in every way over that boundless territory which she possesses. I think she will gain more, and will increase more, by taking that course, than by following a warlike course, and entering upon hostilities with neighboring countries. I do not admit that this acquisition of territory necessarily gives an increase of power. The more you extend your surface, the more you weaken your center; and if Russia, instead of having, as she now has, two capitals—Moscow and St. Petersburg—adds another capital, Constantinople, it is my firm belief that, instead of tending to increase the power of Russia, it will have the very opposite effect. I know that this is not the popular notion, because there is a universal lust in the mind of man to acquire more territory. We see it in all countries—it is an instinct which applies to individuals as well as to nations. But that is not a sound philosophical principle, and it is not the principle which we profess.

But, in the next place, I do not take the encroachments of Russia on Turkey as a sign, still less as a proof, that Russia wants to encroach on us. Russia is encroaching on her neighbors in the East, because her neighbors are a decaying, a disorderly, an anarchical people. Great nations are not destroyed from without, they always perish by suicide from within. There is no instance on record of a nation possessing twenty or thirty millions of inhabitants, united, moral, free, industrious, and intelligent, suffering conquest and extinction from any other Power. Wherever you find a nation eclipsed from the map of the world, you will find that this has been caused, invariably caused, by a period of mismanagement and corruptions, running sometimes through centuries, which lead you to wonder, not that that country was extinguished, but how it was allowed to remain so long without being amalgamated with some other prosperous and more orderly state. Now, I say the case of Turkey is precisely that case. You have Russia, a less barbarous country, better organised, and, with all its faults, more progressive and industrious than Turkey. You find Russia encroaching on Turkey; but I deny that you have proved that the encroachments of Russia are necessarily going to lead to this vast increase of power which is to overshadow the world. I say, take the course which Russia has pursued within the last fifty years, and compare that with the progress of the United States. Putting it in numerals, I say that where Russia has advanced to three, the United States of America have advanced at least to thirty; and I should say, measuring the power which England has gained during the last fifty years as against the power which Russia has attained in the same time, that we have increased four or five times more in importance and wealth than the Russian Empire has. I do not use this as an argument why Russia should encroach on Turkey; but when you tell me I must go to war because you assume certain things are going to happen, I inquire whether you can prove these things by analogy, or show any sound reason for it. I want strong proofs of danger to this country before I will go into war with any country to avert what is, after all, only the calamity you invite me to embrace.

Well, now, to come to the *£ s. d.* of the matter, I am told we must go to war with Russia, because it is an anti-commercial country, and Turkey favors commerce. Here I am not disposed to admit the premises again. I deny that Russia has ever been an anti-commercial country. No Government in the world has ever shown more eagerness to extend commerce. But, it is said, whenever the Russians take possession of a territory, they shut us out by tariffs. That does not make them an anti-commercial people. We were a most commercial people when we had the most restrictive tariffs in the world; and why did we keep up these tariffs except with the view of extending commerce? It was the constant argument that protection was for

the benefit and improvement of commerce. Well, Russia has followed our example, and has become a restrictive country; but there is no restriction in Russia so iniquitous as that restriction which we put on her great staple export—I mean her grain—up to within the last seven years. But when you tell me to go to war because Russia will encroach on the Black Sea, and not keep Constantinople open—that is a fact I deny. All the commerce you have—all the commerce the world has on the Black Sea—is entirely owing to Russian encroachments on the coasts of that Sea; for until Catharine seized the borders of the Black Sea, in 1776, and which led to the erection of Odessa, there was not a merchant vessel allowed to enter the Black Sea. You tell me you are to lose your trade with Wallachia and Moldavia, because Russia is going to make encroachments on that country. Why, I am told by the best authorities connected with that trade, that all the exports of grain and commerce of these countries is owing to the more settled government given to these provinces since the encroachments of Russia in that direction. Do not take my opinion. Take that of McCulloch, in his *Commercial Dictionary*, published fifteen years ago. Treating the matter purely in a commercial spirit, he says—“Whatever objections there may be in a political sense to the encroachments of Russia on the coast of the Black Sea, by giving order to its government, and greater encouragement and security to its industry, it has, undoubtedly, tended to improve the commercial operations of these regions.” In the face of these facts, then, am I to go to war to prevent the possibility of our losing some of our trade with Constantinople?

But when people talk about the trade we carry on with Turkey, I beg to remind them of one fact, that they are arguing in my favor; because that trade is carried on, not by the Turks, or through the Turks, but by the Christians. Whoever heard of a Turkish vessel coming from Turkey, manned with Turks, bringing over freight here for the purposes of commerce? Have you got a Turkish merchant in London, in Liverpool, or in Manchester? Unless he be a consul, have you got one Turkish merchant? You have sixty Greek merchants in Manchester, who carry on all the trade with Constantinople in British manufactured goods. It is the Greek Christians who have all the wealth and the enterprise of the country, and whom I wish to be considered by the people of this country in this great question. The very fact that the commerce of the country is in the hands of the Christians, is a proof that you cannot long maintain that supremacy of Turks over Christians, which it is the object of our diplomatists to accomplish, but which they never will effect.

*Peaceful Intervention.*—I attended a meeting in 1849 at the City of London Tavern to protest against the invasion of Hungary by Russia. Russia was allowed then to march her armies across the territory of Turkey, through Wallachia and Moldavia, to strike a death-blow at the heart of Hungary, and no protest was ever recorded by our Government against that act. And it is my deliberate conviction, from a patient study of the blue-books—and it is the conviction of the most illustrious men who were engaged in that Hungarian struggle—that, if Lord Palmerston had made but a simple verbal protest in energetic terms, Russia would never have invaded Hungary, by passing through the Moldavian and Wallachian territories. It is well known that the Ministers of the Czar almost went down on their knees to beg and entreat him not to embark in a struggle between Austria and Hungary. Our protest would have immediately been backed by the Ministry of the Czar, if it had been made; and I believe it would have prevented that most atrocious outrage, as I consider it, upon the rights and liberties of a constitutional country. I said on that occasion, in the midst of all the excitement and frenzy which then prevailed in favor of Hungarian

nationality, that I would resist any attempt to send an English force to fight the battles of Hungary on the banks of the Danube or the Theiss. I proclaimed the same thing then that I proclaim now. I did not disguise my views on the subject any more than I disguise my views now with regard to the conduct of Russia toward Turkey; but I said I will remain content with uttering my reprobation of the act. I would not sanction the sending of English soldiers and sailors to fight these distant battles. In a word, my opinions and my principles resolve themselves into this, that I will never argue for any battle whatever, as to which I am not prepared to go and take a part in it. I would never send men to some distant part of the world without partaking of their peril; whenever a battle is to be fought, with my consent, it shall be one in which I am willing to take a part myself.

**WEAKNESS OF RUSSIA FOR AGGRESSION.**—Well, I took occasion then, speaking in the City of London Tavern, to say that Russia did not contemplate attacking us; that, if Russia did attack us, such were the great resources of this country—such the enormous resources of wealth, and the scientific appliances which might be used for the purpose of naval warfare and warlike destruction, that we could crumple up the Russian Empire by blockading her ports, and sealing hermetically that semi-barbarous country, so that she could have no communication whatever with the rest of the civilised world. That was what I said. But why do I rate at so low a value the power of the Russian Empire? It is because everything that we have seen in the progress of that country proves that she is comparatively weak, particularly beyond her own frontiers. I don't say within her own borders; because she has shown in the case of Napoleon, that if you go there, you will find but an inhospitable reception. But all history proves that Russia is a very weak country when she attempts to carry on a war beyond her own borders. In her war with Turkey in 1828, and in 1830 in the insurrection in Poland, she had to apply for loans of several millions sterling from Amsterdam. And, if she were meditating a war now, there would be another loan asked from England or from Holland to carry it on, although the money would probably be borrowed on the pretext that it was for some great railway—from Moscow, perhaps, to Siberia. Now, I say that a country which is in such a state that she cannot get the means for carrying on a single campaign without coming to the West to borrow money, is not a formidable Power. And I ground on these facts my conviction, that the Russians will never come to molest you, or to molest any maritime country situated as England and the United States are.

**SPECIFIC OBJECTS OF PEACE MEN.**—If anybody asks what the object of the Peace Conference is, and what are our principles, we say, don't pick out a stray remark that may have been made by this orator, or by another; don't cavil at a little discrepancy that you may find even in the speeches of the same individual. We say, look at these resolutions as they are unanimously passed; they embody the principles and the objects of this Conference. We advocate the cause of arbitration, in lieu of fighting, for the settlement of disputes; and surely anybody above the rank of savages would say that is a desirable end to accomplish. There may be many who will doubt its practicability; with these people we wish to argue this question:—We say, submit your disputes to arbitration; and if you cannot settle your quarrels in that way, and if you afterward resort to the sword, still you will be none the worse than you are now when you resort to the sword without arbitration. You may tell me that there is no court of appeal, with the power to command and to enforce the fulfilment of the decree of arbitrators. That is perfectly true; but, on the other hand, if our plan be carried out, two countries, like France and England for example, will enter into a solemn treaty that any question that does arise between them, which cannot be set-

tled by mutual discussion and negotiation, shall be referred to arbitrators mutually chosen, and who shall have the power, in the final resort, to appoint an umpire. Well, that being, in fact, the solemn treaty binding the two countries, if by any chance there should any quarrel arise, and either of these two countries should refuse to submit the question in dispute to the decision of arbitrators, then I say, if it ever comes in the end to a war, that country which commences the conflict, enters it branded with infamy in the eyes of the whole civilized world, inasmuch as she violated the treaty which she entered into before, and becomes the common disturber of the civilized world, and would array the civilized world in opposition to her.

Well, now, we say that we advocate a mutual reduction of armaments. We don't say, 'disband your army, sink your fleet, and place yourselves prostrate before any enemy who may come to attack you;' but what we say is this; that, if England and France each have ten ships of the line in commission, watching each other from opposite ports, then their relative strength towards each other would be precisely the same if they would reduce the number from ten to five. It is a simple question of arithmetic; and some day or other, when a future generation, wiser than we are, looks back upon our labors, and finds the difficulty we have had in convincing the statesmen of our day, that five have the same reference to five as ten have to ten, they will be astonished at the stolidity of this generation; and if they have any other grievances to redress, or reforms to effect, I think they may take courage in the midst of their difficulties when they find how much difficulty we had to accomplish so trivial an object as that.

**NO LIMIT TO THE EXPENSE OF WAR PREPARATIONS.**—We say we don't think this mode of continually increasing our ships of war, and mutually menacing each other with our fortified coasts, is the best way of securing peace between nations, and particularly between England and France. In the first place, we say it is a very expensive mode, and if the policy which we recommend could be adopted, there will be at once a great saving to the taxpayers of this country, and that those who pay the taxes, if not those who receive them, will be very much obliged to us. I say, also, that it is not only expensive, but it seems to me to be an expense without a limit; because every improvement which is made in the science of shipbuilding—every discovery that can be made by chemists in the art of projecting missiles against each other by ships of war, or by armies—every step which we make in the path of science, is instantly made the argument for increasing the expensiveness of our warlike establishments; while for every fresh discovery that you make, and apply to the art of war, the country on the other side of the Channel must instantly follow your example. And as two countries are thus rivalling each other in these inventions for warlike purposes, and for the improvement of that lovely art of human destruction, why, this increase of expenditure, this rivalry in the game of "beggar-my-neighbor," must constantly go on as long as human reason is, as it will ever be, progressive in its nature and in its capacity.

Mr. Cobden then proceeded to give, as an illustration of this, the improvement which had been made in shipbuilding. First, there were sailing vessels for the purposes of war; then came the discovery of Fulton, the application of the steam-engine to the propulsion of ships; paddle-wheel steamers followed; and then an ingenious man, looking at the fish as it glided through the water, bethought him that he might apply the movement of the fish's tail to the stern of a ship, and thus the screw was found available for mercantile ships; and now we have come to the conclusion, that all our line-of-battle ships must have screw propellers put to them. So that the paddle-wheel, which before was considered the principal contrivance for marine warfare, has now become superseded in a great degree by the application of the screw to our enormous line-of-battle ships. There is no

doubt, that in the course of a few years, a great, unwieldy, unmanageable, and, in calm weather, useless hulk on the ocean, like a sailing line-of-battle ship, will not be found in any war navy where the government has the power to purchase an engine, or construct a screw.

Well, now, have we got to the end of it? I see in the papers a great laudation of these huge monsters of screw vessels; for instance, there is the Duke of Wellington. I have seen gentlemen—I have read the reports of gentlemen's speeches—one by a very bellicose friend of mine, made at Sheffield. The Hon. Member for Sheffield made a bellicose speech there. He talked about the naval review at Spithead being the great Peace Society! I have seen in speeches at other festivals, statements made that the Duke of Wellington, this most enormous vessel-of-war, is the best guarantee you have for perpetual peace—that the Agamemnon and the Duke of Wellington are the best guarantees for permanent peace! Now, the Duke of Wellington is a ship about 350 feet in length, and I think measures about 50 feet odd from the deck to the bottom of the hold—as tall as one of your high houses, and a great deal longer—an enormous structure. Well, but what are our merchants about now? Have they stood still with their screw vessels of 3000 tons burden? I see it announced that there is a vessel coming from America of 6000 or 7000 tons; but that is not all. In the great fire that took place the other day in the yard of my friend, Mr. Scott Russell, in London, there was destroyed the model of a vessel, the whole particulars of which I had from him two months before, the money for which had been subscribed, the point of departure and point of destination of which had been settled, and that vessel—what are its dimensions? It will be 12,000 tons burden, and 2000 horse-power. Was it a paddle-wheel or a screw? Why, an ingenious mechanic had taken another look at the fish, and he had seen that, besides the tail, it had fins; and he says,—‘We must have a vessel, not only with paddles, but with a screw also; and here is a plan for a vessel of 12,000 tons, upwards of 500 feet in length, with paddle-wheels at the side, and a screw propeller in the stern, having three steam-engines, with a united force of 2000 horses.

Now, I have seen it stated most triumphantly in our papers—and the statement has been copied into the French journals—that the Duke of Wellington vessel of which I have spoken—this vessel, of little more than one-quarter the size of the vessel whose lines I have told you were laid down, and out of which will be constructed a vessel of such a power—could, such is its enormous bulk, run down and tear in halves any frigate by the mere propulsion of its engine, without feeling hardly any shock to itself in the process. But if this new steamer is carried out and built, why, it may run down the Duke of Wellington, just as the Duke of Wellington may run down any frigate. Well, then, we will suppose the French government chooses to come and buy from Mr. Scott Russell, or order from Mr. Scott Russell, a vessel of these dimensions—will our gallant visitor tell us then that the Duke of Wellington is a guarantee for universal and perpetual peace? Will the 3500 tons be a match for the 12,000 tons? But do you suppose that men of intellect and ingenuity will stop there? I have heard it surmised, that since the principle found most profitable in the management of great factories may be applied to ships, there is no earthly reason why, if built of iron on the principle of the tubular Menai Bridge, we should not have vessels of 20,000 tons, which may be great ferry-boats carrying the population of a whole town, if you will, across the Atlantic—leaving in deep water at Milford Haven, and landing their passengers on the first bluff headland in America, to be conveyed by railroads to their different destinations. Well, then, what becomes of this principle of maintaining perpetual peace by means of the standing armaments? What I argue is this—there is no possible limit to the expense you may be put to by

going on in this way, and to your always aiming at having something larger and stronger than France, in order to guard our coasts from an invasion.

Well, we now propose another resolution—it is the last—that it is desirable that we should encourage, by every possible way, the intercourse of nations. The more nations communicate with each other, the more likely they are to remain at peace. The assimilation of weights and measures—the assimilation of coinage—the proposed adoption of a more uniform system of mercantile law and usage, besides a freer commercial intercourse, and the adoption of the ocean penny postage—all these are encouraging to the friends of peace to hope for the desirable result. Now, is there any human being who could say that there is one of these resolutions which it is not desirable, if practicable, to carry into effect?

**OTHER MEANS OF COERCION THAN WAR.**—But is war, after all, the only mode by which you could coerce Russia? Are there no moral means by which if you want to show your indignation with her, you can do so? Are there no means of outlawing her, of putting her under the ban of the rest of the world? Now, for instance, take the question of loans; and I have no hesitation in saying that if we were to pass a law in this country prohibiting the sale of Russian stock in our Exchange, and making it penal to grant any loan for any purpose, directly or indirectly, to the government of Russia, you would strike a severer blow at the pretensions of that country than by sending your fleet to Besika Bay. You may tell me that this is contrary to all the principles of political economy, and that it would be considered equivalent to a declaration of war. I say that a violation of the principles of political economy is not half so bad as entering upon a war. And I say that a moral demonstration of that kind, even if it ultimately led to war, would be, at all events, an attempt, in the first instance, to apply coercion by other means than by physical force. Thus, instead of receiving the Princesses of the Russian Imperial family as we did—sending steam-ships and bringing them to England—carrying them about to the Isle of Wight, and so on, all which may be proper enough when they come to enjoy our hospitality—could we not give notice to the Russian Emperor not to let any of the Imperial family visit this country at all? Could we not say, ‘Don’t come here yourself, and don’t attempt to hold any communication with us; don’t think of borrowing money here; don’t think of having diplomatic relations with us; but consider yourself as in a state of moral outlawry?’ Well, mind you, I do not recommend this to be done; but what I say is you who argue that we should go to war for certain things, which I believe would not be accomplished by it, try to coerce this power by some other moral means.

**NEED OF A PEACE PARTY.**—I think there is much truth in what Horace Walpole said that the “death of party in Constitutional States is the birth of faction.” We must have parties, or we shall have no principles; and we must have principles in order to have a party. Now, there is wanted a party, a party which embraces every element of progress, which embraces reforms of every kind, which embraces the only solid career of liberty, which embraces the social improvement and prosperity of the people—and a party whom statesmen will be glad some day to rally round, as they once did on another question—that party shall be the **PEACE PARTY**.

EXTRACTS FROM THE SPEECH OF JOHN BRIGHT, M. P.

**INCONSISTENCIES OF THE WAR POLICY.**—Now we are here to-night to contest that which probably will be allowed by all men to be the greatest evil apparent on the surface of society throughout the Christian nations of the globe. We are here to protest against the small progress which nations have made

of late years toward that consummation for which all good men hope, when war shall no longer be known among civilised and Christian communities. We stand humiliated when we recollect that we are in the thirty-eighth year of peace; that since the year 1815 there has been no general or considerable war in Europe, and yet that all the nations of Europe are in a position so prepared for war, as if but yesterday the treaty of peace had been signed. Within the memory of many persons here, Europe has undergone a conflict of twenty-five years duration,—a conflict such as has no parallel in the modern history of Europe. Sacrifices then were made which can never be reckoned; results were supposed to be gained, which prove now to be no results at all. A Congress assembled at Vienna, a great settlement was arrived at, and there was a grand song of triumph and of peace throughout the kingdoms of Europe. Since then, too, we have had annual congratulations that we were at peace. We have been congratulated upon the fact that his Majesty in former times, and her Majesty in latter times, have had the satisfaction of assuring the people of this country that we were living in a state of the most delightful amity with all the nations of the world; and whenever there have been king's speeches in other parts of Europe, we have had almost always the same declaration; and our newspapers have spoken of the long peace, the continued peace, and of the gratitude we should feel for the long enjoyment of peace. Speeches from platforms have spoken of peace, and sermons by thousands have appealed to congregations for their gratitude to heaven that this country was blessed with the enjoyment of peace. Well, during all this time, when there had not been actual war, it is a cheering consideration that throughout Europe great improvements have taken place. Portions of that Continent which were never traversed by roads before, have been freely and entirely opened up—railroads are now penetrating into remote districts—telegraphs are to be seen almost everywhere—industry has made great progress—towns have become larger, more healthy, and their decorations are observable on every side—education is more extended—travelling is so common that it is almost as cheap and easy to go to the other side of Europe as it is to sit at home.

**INCREASE OF TAXES FOR WAR PURPOSES.**—Now, notwithstanding all this by some unfortunate mistake in principle or in practice, the nations of Europe have been expending more and more, from year to year, in preparations for war, which war is always said to be the more distant the longer the peace is continued. Everybody has been in the habit of saying that every year added to the time of peace, makes the probability of war the more remote; and yet, while these are the maxims, if not adopted, at least propounded by statesmen, these very statesmen, while propounding these maxims, are constantly adding to the permanent forces of the respective countries which they govern. While they assert that the probability of war is annually becoming less, the expenditure has increased to an incredible amount.

Now, if military expenditure increases, as a matter of course taxes must increase also; for all this military expenditure must come out of labor, and from the sweat of men who toil from sunrise to sunset, and to whom all their labor gives but a very moderate share of the necessities, and scarcely any of the luxuries, of life. And taxes and expenditures are generally followed by something approaching bankruptcy. Loans are constantly being required. It is not long since Russia required a loan; and it is a hundred chances to one but Russia must come for another loan in a very short time. The expenditure she is undergoing now, although she is not actually engaged in war,—an expenditure which is wholly unnecessary, which comes merely from an ungovernable ambition,—that expenditure will force Russia to come for another loan. The loans of Austria are just as many and as often as Austria can find dupes to lend her anything. I have here a memo-

random of the deficits of the Austrian revenue since 1846. In 1847, the deficit was £700,000; in 1848 it was 4 1-2 millions sterling; in 1849 it was 12 millions; in 1850 it was more than 5 millions; in 1851 it was more than six millions; and, in 1852, more than 7 millions—the whole of the deficits of Austria in those six years being upward of 34 millions, or an average of £5,700,000 (\$28,500,000) per annum. You may conceive—no, you cannot conceive it—but you may endeavor to imagine to some extent what must be the pressure of taxation upon a people where the deficit is annually going on at this rate. As it is not possible for the government by any turning of the taxing-screw to obtain sufficient from the people to make up these deficits, the government comes continually to the various moneyed capitalists of Europe, and asks them for a loan; and I see in the papers of yesterday or to-day, a statement that the Austrian Government has just made an offer for a loan of seven millions sterling to a great banking or monied firm, and there is a very curious condition attached to it, that it is only to be lent in case Austria does not go to war!

England is less military than the other nations of Europe. Her constitution has made that necessary and inevitable. Her position, also, is different. We can have no kind of need for a great standing army in this country. But yet, constituted as we are—not having had a *coup d'état*—not having Lombardy on the one side, and Hungary on the other—not having a great and semi-barbarous empire like Russia to govern—not being sunk in every conceivable corruption, like the governments of Italy—having none of these reasons to maintain a great standing army, and to adopt a great military position—yet this country is suffering more, I believe, to be added to its military expenditure every year, than any other country on the face of the earth. I suspect that we have borne the burden of that great debt so long, that we begin to fancy it is no really so heavy as it is. But we do pay twenty-eight millions a year for the unfortunate policy of our forefathers; and there may come a day when that burden will just make all the difference between us and the great rival nation on the other side of the Atlantic. I spoke the other day to an American gentleman, who adverted to the fact that the United States had so large a surplus revenue that they did not very well know what to do with it—whether they should at once pay off all their debt, or whether they should expend the surplus in making a great railroad connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific. He contrasted the state of his country with the condition of ours. He said, 'Your twenty-eight millions of annual interest on the national debt is an incredible sum. Twenty-eight millions a year!—we cannot comprehend it—it is not to be reckoned in dollars and cents. But, he said, I reckon there will come a day when England and the United States are about neck and neck, and the twenty-eight millions upon the industry of the United Kingdom will tell something against you in your race with the United States.'

But we are not content with the experience of the twenty-five years' conflict to which I have referred. In this very year, 1853, after thirty-eight years of peace,—every year making war less probable—we are spending seventeen millions of the taxes of the United Kingdom in the maintenance of our army and navy. We are not content even with this. We are occupiers and rulers of a vast empire in Asia; and under the Government,—the joint *hocus-pocus* Government of the Board of Control and the East India Company,—we take from the people of India a gross sum of twenty-nine millions per annum in taxes—from a people who do not get more than 2d. or 3d. a day of wages, who have no steam engines, who have a rude agriculture, who have no roads, who are deprived of almost every advantage which in this country we have in being a great producing country. We take from them a gross revenue of twenty-nine millions per annum, being a net revenue of twenty-three or twenty-four millions, and spend twelve

millions of it in military armaments in that country ; so that, adding together the sums that we now pay every year for wars past, and in preparations for war to come, namely, twenty-eight millions of debt, and seventeen of expenditure here, we have forty-five millions ; and, with the twelve millions of military expenditure in India, taken from the taxes of the people of India by the power of this country, we have a total of fifty-seven millions sterling per annum, (\$285,000,000).

Yet it cannot be denied,—I suppose it is not to be denied,—that we are a Christian country. But look at our progress since 1835. We spent in that year eleven millions upon our army and navy ; we spend now seventeen millions. We had been at peace from 1815 to 1835—a period of twenty years—and then we found eleven millions to be sufficient. From 1835 to 1853, we raised our military expenditure from eleven to seventeen millions per annum, being an increase of six millions a year ; and in India, the expenditure, which, when the last Charter Act was granted in 1833, was eight millions, when it was reconstructed last session amounted to not less than twelve millions ; so that, in this country and in India, we are now spending ten millions a year more in military affairs—being all the while in profound peace—than we were expending sixteen, eighteen, or twenty years ago.

Now, I believe that people do not know anything about this expenditure when it is placed in millions. I have an extract from an author who wrote seventy years ago, the now celebrated Arthur Young, who travelled through Ireland, and wrote a book upon it ; and who also travelled through France, and wrote a very interesting work upon France, and what he saw there. He describes the misery which had occurred to France from the warlike reign of Louis XIV., and says, speaking of England, “To reason with a British Parliament, when her noisy, factious orators are bawling for the honor of the British lion, for the rights of commerce, and freedom of navigation, that is, for a war, that such a war will cost a million sterling, and they are deaf to you. But let it cost them those roads on which they roll so luxuriously, the public bridges, and the great edifices which decorate the capital and our other cities, if the members were willing at such a price to hazard a war, the people would probably pull down their houses. A very little calculation would show, that the expense of our three last wars, which had no other effect whatever but to spill blood, and fill gazettes, would have made the whole island of Great Britain a garden, the whole coast a quay, and converted all the houses in her towns into palaces, and her cottages into houses.” Now, this was written and published, and notorious before our forefathers entered into the French war ; and if Arthur Young had lived till now, he might have written another chapter in the same way, and might have shown unquestionably that we were very little wiser than our forefathers, and that there was some danger of our becoming even more foolish and wicked than ever.

HOW POSTERITY WILL VIEW IT.—When we come to a saner moment, when we become a more enlightened people, when we become in any degree what we profess to be, a Christian nation, then our posterity will look back on these times with wonder and astonishment. They will say, were there no churches in 1853 ?—were there no chapels ?—were there no ministers of the gospel of peace ? What were these men doing all the time ? Were they splitting hairs ? Were they disputing whether baptism should be by the sprinkling of an infant, or by the immersing of a grown man ? Were they disputing whether it was lawful to burn candles on the altar ? Were they disputing as to the precise amount of labor a man might do, or might not do, on the Sabbath ? What were the ministers and your people about ? Were your sects, your professing Christian sects, hunting each other to death ? Why were they not rather awakening the people to this

gigantic and incredible evil, and endeavoring to wipe away from this Christian nation the heaviest disgrace that has ever attached to it?

**THE TAXES FOR WAR EXTORTED FROM THE POOREST.**—But the mere expenditure is nothing. What are taxes? Whence comes the gold by which you pay your income-tax and succession-tax, your excise and custom-house duties, which cause you to pay almost double price for many of the things you consume? It is not picked up in the street. No; it is chiefly the labor of all this population you meet day by day in town and country, men suffering under all weathers, and under adverse circumstances. What class is it that the pestilence sweeps down? Not the class that is comfortably off, but the class which is the lowest in society, whose labor is the most severe, and whose toil is the least rewarded, who pass from the cradle to the grave, and know little of those many comforts which many of us every day enjoy. That is the class which is pressed into poverty, misery, ignorance and crime, and all the evils to which man can be subjected, and pressed with an infinitely heavier screw when a Government extorts from the people an amount of taxes which are not absolutely necessary for the service of the country.

Well, then, why should we not look at this question as a great practical question? Our forefathers have done many things in this country, and we have done some things; why cannot we do this? The Emperor of France may say, 'I cannot reduce my army to 200,000 men; my position is not very secure. I have not the prestige of a venerable, ancient monarchy like England.' Austria may say, 'I have Lombardy on the one side, and Hungary on the other.' But we can say none of these things. We have a Government which men respect. We have a monarch, perhaps, yea, certainly, who will bear comparison, and favorable comparison, with any, or with all, of her predecessors on the English throne. We have a people more united, I undertake to say, at this moment, with regard to the law, more united, as a nation, than we have ever had at any former period of our history. We have no necessity for a force to keep down the people, and to enforce obedience to the law; and yet our Government, by a succession of tricks, by juggling the people, by the people permitting themselves to be frightened now by one story, then by another, have persuaded the people to permit them to raise our military expenditure from eleven to seventeen millions a year, from 1835 to 1853.

**WHY SUCH ENORMOUS EXPENDITURE.**—Now, this great military expenditure is not a thing necessary. They keep up the army and navy to this extent that they may raise the taxes. They do not raise the taxes that they may keep an army and navy. That is a great portion of our system of governing. Seventeen millions of expenditure creates an enormous interest, and that interest always goes with the Executive Government. That interest corrupts men, and blinds them to the great morality of the question; and thus, all over the country, and just as much in Scotland as anywhere else, you find families in scores and hundreds, who, somehow or other, have a little bit of the seventeen millions. And when a man once gets into office, it is not this question alone he shuts his eyes to, but every other question. He knows on which side his bread is buttered, and he takes good care not to disturb a system which works exceedingly well for him.

**THE AIMS AND ARGUMENTS OF PEACE MEN.**—Now, what is it that we really want here? We wish to protest against the maintenance of great armaments in time of peace; we wish to protest against the spirit which is not only willing for war, but eager for war; and we wish to protest, with all the emphasis of which we are capable, against the mischievous policy pursued so long by this country, of interfering with the internal affairs of other countries, and thereby leading to disputes, and often to disastrous wars.

I mentioned last night what it is we are annually spending on our armaments. Admiral Napier says Mr. Cobden had persuaded a feeble Government to reduce the armaments of this country to "nothing." Why, what is "nothing" in the Admiral's estimation? Fifteen millions a year (\$75,000,000.) Was all that money thrown away? We have it in the estimates; we pay it out of the taxes; it is appropriated by Parliament; it sustains your dockyards, pays the wages of your men, and maintains your ships. Fifteen millions of sterling paid in the very year when the Admiral says that my Hon. friend reduced the armaments of the country to nothing! But take the sums which we spent for the past year for warlike preparation—seventeen millions, and the interest on debt caused by war—twenty millions sterling; and it amounts to £45,000,000 (\$225,000,000.) What are our whole exports? Even this year, far the largest year of exports we have ever known, they may amount to £80,000,000. Well, then, plant some one at the mouth of every port in the United Kingdom, and let him take every alternate ship that leaves your rivers and your harbours with all its valuable cargo on board, and let him carry them off as a tribute; and it will not amount to the cost that you pay every year for a war, that fifty years ago was justified as much as it is attempted to justify this impending war, and for the preparations which you now make after a peace which has lasted for 38 years. Every 20 years—in a nation's life nothing, in a person's life something—every 20 years a thousand million sterling, (four thousand million dollars) out of the industry of the hard-working people of this United Kingdom, is extorted, appropriated, and expended to pay for that unnecessary and unjust war, and for the absurd and ruinous expenditure which you now incur.

A thousand millions every twenty years! Why, apply a thousand millions, not every twenty years, but for one period of twenty years, to objects of good in this country; and it would be rendered more like a paradise than anything that history records of human condition, and would make so great a change in these islands, that a man having seen them as they are now, and seeing them as they might then be, would not recognise them as the same country, nor our population as the same people.

But what do we expend all this for? Bear in mind that admirals, and generals, and statesmen defended that great war, and that your newspapers, with scarcely an exception, were in favour of it, and denounced and ostracised hundreds of good men who dared, as we dare now, to denounce the spirit which would lead this country into ruinous war. We went to war that France should not choose its own government; the grand conclusion was that no Bonaparte should sit on the throne of France; yet France has all along been changing its Government from that time to this, and now we find ourselves with a Bonaparte on the throne of France, and, for anything I know to the contrary, likely to remain there a good while. So far, therefore, for the calculations of our forefathers, and for the results of that enormous expenditure which they have saddled upon us.

Well, then, we object to these great armaments as provoking a war spirit. Now, I should like to ask, what was the object of the Chobham exhibition? There were special trains at the disposal of members of Parliament, to go down to Chobham one day, and to Spithead another? What was the use of our pointing to the President of the French Republic two years ago, who is the Emperor now, and saying he was spending his time at playing at soldiers at his great camp at Satory, and in making great circuses for the amusement of his soldiers. We, too, are getting into the way of playing at soldiers, and camps and fleets, and the object of this is to raise up in the spirit of the people a feeling antagonistic to peace; and to render the people—the deluded, hard-working, toiling people,—satisfied with the extortion of £17,000,000 annually, when, upon the very principles of the men who

take it, it might be demonstrated that one-half of the money would be amply sufficient for the purpose to which it is devoted. What has been more common as an observation during this discussion upon Turkey than this—‘Why are we to keep up these great fleets if we are not to use them? Why have we our Mediterranean fleet lying at Besika Bay, when it might be earning glory, and adding to the warlike renown of the country?’ This is just what comes from the maintenance of great fleets and armies. There grows up an *esprit du corps*—there grows a passion for these things, a powerful opinion in their favour, that smothers the immorality of the whole thing, and leads the people to tolerate, under those excited feelings, things which, under feelings of greater temperance and moderation, they would know were hostile to their country, as they are opposed to everything which we recognise as the spirit of the Christian religion.

**WHAT IS WAR?**—I believe that half the people who talk about war, have not the slightest idea of what it is. In a short sentence, it may be summed up to be the combination and concentration of all the horrors, atrocities, crimes, and sufferings, of which human nature on this globe is capable.

**COST OF MERE RUMORS OF WARS.**—But what is even a rumour of war? Is there anybody here who has a large stock of raw material or manufactured goods? The funds have recently gone down 10 per cent. I do not say that that fall is all on account of this danger of war, but a great proportion of it undoubtedly is. A fall of 20 per cent. in the funds is nearly 80 millions sterling of value, and railway stock having gone down 20 per cent., makes a difference of 60 millions in the value of the railway property of this country. Add the two—140 millions—and take the diminished prosperity and value of manufactures of all kinds during the last few months, and you will understate the actual loss to the country, now, if you put it down at 200 millions sterling [1,000,000,000.] But that is merely a rumour of war. That is war a long way off—the small cloud, no bigger than a man’s hand—what will it be if it comes nearer and becomes a fact? And surely sane men ought to consider whether the case is a good one, the ground fair, the necessity clear, before they drag a nation of nearly 30,000,000 of people into a long and bloody struggle, for a decrepit and tottering empire, which all the nations in Europe cannot long sustain.

**WAR NOW A GREATER EVIL THAN FORMERLY.**—And, mind, war now would take a different aspect than it formerly did. It is not only that you send out men who submit to be slaughtered, that you pay a large amount of taxes—the amount of taxes would be but a feeble indication of what you would suffer. Our trade is now much more extensive than it was; our commerce is more expanded, our undertakings are more vast, and war will find you all at home by the drying and withering up of the resources of the prosperity of the middle and working classes of the country. You would find that war in 1853 would be infinitely more perilous and destructive to our country, than it has ever yet been at any other former period of our history. There is another question which comes home to my mind with a gravity and seriousness, which I can scarcely hope to communicate to you. You who lived during the period from 1815 to 1822 may remember that this country was probably never in a more uneasy position. The sufferings of the working classes were beyond description; and the difficulties, and struggles, and bankruptcies of the middle classes were such as few persons have a just idea of. There was scarcely a year in which there was not an incipient insurrection in some part of the country, arising from the sufferings which the working classes endured. You know very well that the Government of the day employed spies to create plots, and to get ignorant men to combine to take unlawful oaths; and you know that in the town of Stirling, two men who, but for this diabolical agency, might have lived good and honest citizens,

paid the penalties of their lives for their connection with unlawful combinations of this kind. Well, if you go into war now you will have more banners to decorate cathedrals and churches. Englishmen will fight as well now as ever they did, and there is ample power to back them if the country can be but sufficiently excited and deluded. You will raise up great generals. You will have another Wellington, and another Nelson too: for this country can grow men capable for every enterprise. Then, there will be titles, and there will be pensions, and there will be marble monuments to eternalise the men who thus become great; but what becomes of you and your country, and your children?

REMARKS OF THOMAS BIGGS, M. P.

**FOREIGN ALLIANCES, OCCASIONS OF WAR.**—Our foreign alliances are a source of the greatest danger to us in the future, and more likely to lead to an increase of our debt, by involving us in frequently recurring and perhaps interminable wars, than any other department of our foreign policy; and consequently this department ought not only to be more closely attended to by an enlightened public, but placed at once and forever under the closest popular control. The Americans manage their foreign affairs, in all respects, infinitely better than we do. In the United States, no war can be entered into, or treaty made, except by a vote of the Senate, representing, as it does, every State throughout the entire federal Union. When war is declared, the President, as the Executive, can carry it on; but he has no power of declaring or commencing war. This is as it should be; the parties most deeply interested in the events of the war, and most affected by its expense and inconvenience, ought to be the parties who should have the option of declaring it, or otherwise. In our country the theory of our constitution is, that the Queen has the prerogative of declaring war; and, although we all know this to be a mere legal fiction, it is of course, declared by her responsible advisers. The people, as a whole, do not possess the slightest control over it. It is not submitted to the House of Commons, as the representatives of the people; it is not submitted to the House of Lords; it is, in fact, absolutely and entirely in the hands of an aristocratic clique. Now, is it fair, or right, or proper, that a country like our own, in some respects the freest in the world, should entrust its duties, as respects its foreign affairs, to such irresponsible hands?

As a consequence of the irresponsible character of this department, we have treaties and alliances made of the most questionable character. The fact is, our alliances are so extended and multiplied all over Europe, that we have not the keeping of the peace in our hand; any little paltry nationality, whether we will or not, can any day commit us to a war. This is not only worse than folly, but fraught with the greatest possible risks, and costs, and dangers for the future. If this country has anything to fear or dread as to the future, it is the possible result of our foreign alliances; the prospective debts and excessive taxes growing out of the contingent wars incident to these connections, are more likely to diminish our productive capital and thus precipitate our national decline, than all other causes put together.

**OBJECTIONS TO ENGLAND'S PRESENT ALLIANCE WITH TURKEY.**—Let me now refer to our existing connection with Turkey. Whether there is actually a treaty or not, there is, at all events, a commonly recognised, universally admitted understanding that we are honorably committed to fight for Turkey, in the event of her being attacked by Russia. I have read every work which has been written on the subject of Turkey for the last thirty years, and I believe that the Turks are without exception the most depraved, barbarous, and demoralized community that ever existed in either Europe or Asia. Even our business connection, about which so much has been said, is utterly profitless, when we take into account the cost of our

maritime establishments in the Levant; in fact, it is every year a losing concern.

Beyond this, I consider the connection inexpedient and dangerous in the highest possible degree; and, further still, I conceive it to be an absolutely *immoral connection*. We are maintaining an ascendancy of three millions of Mahomedan tyrants over twelve millions of our fellow-Christians; we are perpetuating the existence of a Mahometan empire in Europe, which could not be continued for a year without our countenance and support. I am addressing men who have taken a laudable and active interest in the emancipation of the West India slaves; but I tell you we even now *tolerate and permit* the existence of domestic slavery in one of the finest countries in Europe. We are the ally of the Turk, and it is notorious that there are 50,000 slaves in Constantinople. We are *morally* responsible for this state of things. But for us, Mahomedan Turkey would have faded from the maps of Europe like a dissolving view. We put down slavery on the coast of Africa, and yet tolerate it in the dominions of an ally. That slavery is chargeable at our doors. We support the Turks, and we thus accessarily support their *slavery*, their *vices*, and their *crimes*. *We are morally answerable before God for the continued existence of this slavery.*

If time would allow, I could quote from every traveller who has written upon Turkey for the last thirty years, and narrate instances of barbarities and massacres within our own time, which would utterly put them out of the pale of the sympathies of any civilised nation. White and black slaves are every day imported, and every day sold, in the market of Constantinople, with the cognizance and connivance of the British Government, in the capital city of a people with whom we are in the closest political alliance. This makes us partners in their criminality; and it is impossible we can escape it.

When the dark cloud which now hovers over this Eastern question has blown over and disappeared, it will then become our duty, as our interest, seriously to consider the immorality of this political connection. I maintain that, after due notice, it ought to be cancelled, and that we should shake clear of such a dangerous and profitless alliance. We ought to adopt the policy, enunciated by Washington in his valedictory address, of 'Free trade and honest intercourse with all nations, and entangling alliances with none.' By this means we shall not only escape wars, or chances of wars, but practically carry out the principles of the Peace Society, by extending an advanced civilization throughout the world; for civil liberty and Christianity have ever followed in the train of commerce. The only solution of this Eastern question, however long it may be delayed, is the *ultimate establishment of a free Christian nationality upon the ruins of Mahometan Turkey*. I consider this proposition of cancelling our foreign alliances to be one eminently practical, and one which, if adopted, would be more likely to secure the peace of Europe and the world, than any other proposition which the Peace Society have ever entertained.

Extracts from the speeches of Elihu Burritt, Rev. Dr. Massie, and other Christian Ministers, of Lawrence Heyworth, and several other members of Parliament, are reluctantly omitted for want of room.

#### TESTIMONIES FROM EMINENT MEN.

From the letters sent to the Conference by men of eminence belonging to various classes,—statesmen, men of science and letters, business men, and christian ministers,—we give the following extracts as specimens:—

**MEN OF SCIENCE.**—*Sir David Brewster.*—The longer I live the more I am convinced of the necessity of a powerful association to plead the cause of universal peace and international arbitration; and I feel confident that the time is

not far distant, when war will be as impossible among civilized nations as duelling is among civilized men. I am persuaded you will find that the principles and objects of the Peace Society have been better appreciated in Scotland than in any other part of the empire, and that the most distinguished men of all denominations of Christians will give the cause their warmest support.

STATESMEN.—*Joseph Hume*.—I am more convinced by what has occurred in Europe during the last twelve months, that the course suggested by the late Conferences is the proper course to be followed by Sovereigns of States to avoid war, and it ought to be persevered in. I would not say that all international disputes can be amicably adjusted by arbitration; but an attempt should in every case be made, and experience teaches us that in many cases such attempts have been eminently successful.

If my speech to the Earl of Aberdeen, at the last meeting in Downing-street, be referred to, it will be seen that we ask the Cabinets and Kings of Europe to do with national disputes and claims what every prudent man does in any disputes he may be involved in; and the Earl of Aberdeen admitted that view of mine to be reasonable, and he admitted the benefit that may be derived from having a previous declaration from Kings and Cabinets to that purport. That is all which can be done, and all we ask. If the substitution of arbitration could be adopted generally in Europe, the reduction of the present enormous military and naval establishments would follow.

If it be for one moment considered that the industry and finances of Europe are burdened with the payment of near two millions [an estimate much too low] of unproductive men, who might be employed in productive industry, it must follow that the interest and welfare of every country would be promoted by the retrenchment and economy which would follow the adoption of arbitration. Where there are persons who will not allow that wars are against Scripture, it seems of importance to rest our proposition on the great social and economical benefits that each nation would derive from the reduction of the present large military establishments.

*M. Auguste Visschers*.—That which was with me five years ago, when I received for the first time the visit of the delegates of the London Peace Society, only a matter of sentiment, an instinctive opinion, has become a principle as the result of reflection, and of the study of those conditions which can alone bring to pass the improvement and the happiness of the human race.

Discouragements certainly have not been wanting during the five years which have since elapsed; but amid the indifference of some, and the raillery of others, I have been able to ascertain one fact, namely, a new signification has been given, a peculiar sense has been attached, to the word—PEACE.

In Germany, where I have been recently travelling, I found that this idea of universal peace, and the remembrance of the Peace Congress at Frankfort, had been imbibed by many minds of the right stamp. The popular feeling has accepted this expression: *Friedens Congress*, as in France, and in Belgium, the name of *Congress de la Paix*, has become incorporated in their language. This is one of the results of the efforts of the friends of peace of Great Britain and the United States of North America. True, it appears at present only as a feeble light; but this light suffices to show how profound is that obscurity in which the minds of men have remained so long plunged; gradually it will brighten and expand, until its rays of light shall reach the farthest ends of the world.

I look upon these Congresses, Sir, as an excellent means of impressing public opinion, when they are composed of numbers belonging to diverse nationalities like our late statistical Congress, which comprised delegates from twenty-seven States. They serve admirably to conciliate and draw people together, and strengthen those ties which make the human species one great family, the father of whom is our Divine Creator.

I trust that circumstances will permit us before long to meet again in some continental city. It is necessary to the development of moral ideas, that the choicest minds should be in communication. The morality of private life ought to find its corollary in the conduct of governments and states towards one another. The impulse is already given; nor will missionaries be wanting for the propagation of ideas which testify a profound confidence in the designs of Providence, and in the destinies of humanity.

MERCANTILE MEN.—*Samuel Garney*.—I never was more convinced than I am now of the absolute inconsistency, with the principles laid down by our blessed Lord, of war in all its bearings, also of its real impolicy—under which feeling I should have been glad to have partaken with my friends of the interest and the responsibilities of the Conference. Had I been able to attend it, I should have been glad to have borne my testimony against a military interference on the part of Great Britain in the difficulties existing in the east of Europe. A military interference, in fact, only adds fuel to the fire, of which there is so much danger of its bursting out at this time. It would greatly mar the prosperity with which this land has been so eminently blessed; and if the first duty of Government is to promote and confirm the happiness of their people and of their neighbors, where is the honor or the duty of an opposite course, —a course having an effect directly opposite, and that can result only in misery, loss of life, and happiness, not only to ourselves, but to our neighbors. I trust it will be averted and this great evil avoided by a continuance of judicious diplomatic intervention.

*Receipts in December, 1853.*

New York, Wm. B. Crosby,	100,00		New Bedford, Susan Howland,	10,00
" A. Boynton, (75 before in 1853.)	75,00	175,00	" W. P. Howland,	10,00
So. Reading, Thomas Emerson,	10,00	10,00	" Ab'n Barker,	10,00
Medford, Jorham Stetson,	5,00	15,00	" Jos Ricketson,	5,00
" D. Hall,	5,00		" Andrew Robeson,	1,00
Beverly, INGALLS KITTREDGE, L.M.	20,00		" P. G. Macomber,	3,00
" Phillip English,	5,00		" J. D. Hall,	2,00
" A. Thorndike,	5,00		" Benj. T. Heman,	2,00
" Daniel Hildreth,	5,00		" E. Colby,	3,00
" A. T. Doyle,	5,00		" Jos. Congdon,	3,00
" N. Bachelder,	2,00		" J. B. Congdon,	2,00
" Seth Dodge,	2,00		" John Perkins,	2,00
" Edward Stone,	2,00		" Edward D. Mandell,	2,00
" Samuel S. Ober,	2,00		" C. R. Tucker,	2,00
" John Tacket,	2,00		" Others,	5,00
" John Tuck,	2,00		Gardner, Lewis Glazier,	10,00
" C. Wallis,	1,00	53,00	Concord, Reuben Brown,	10,00
Salem,		2,00	" T. B. Mackay,	10,00
Ipswich, Mary C. Farley,	5,00		" Cash,	3,00
" Mrs. Geo. W. Hurd,	5,00		" D. Shattuck,	3,00
" Cash,	2,00		" J. M. Cheney,	2,00
" Others,	4,00	16,00	" Others,	5,00
Sudbury, Col. in Evang'l Soc.,	5,00	8,10	Amesbury Mills, D. French,	2,00
Reading, Henry Kingman	3,00		" Others,	2,00
" C. Wakefield,	2,00		Newburyport Prof. A. Crosby,	5,00
" Loton Parker,	2,00		" Others,	6,25
" Eben Emerson,	2,00		Farmington, C. A. Thomson,	5,00
" Stephen Foster,	2,00		Uniontown, Pa., Elizabeth Cursstead,	2,00
" Others,	4,50	18,50	Winchester, Z. Abbott,	2,00
St. Johnsbury, Vt. J. P. FAIRBANKS,			Woburn, L. Wright,	2,00
L. D.	100,00		" Thos. Richardson,	3,00
Bridgewater, JAMES M. LEONARD,			" Oliver Bacon,	3,00
(part) L. M.	10,00		" J. Fowle,	2,00
Fairhaven, L. Tripp,	5,00		" Others,	2,00
" Sylvanus Allen,	5,00		Conway, Joseph Avery,	2,00
" Nathan Church,	2,00		Brookline, N. H., Estate of the late	
" Nathaniel Church,	2,00		Dea. Eleazer Gilson, by	
" Nathaniel Hathaway,	2,00		Robt. Seaver, Executor,	68,17
" B. Taber,	2,00		Southfic'd, OTS LOMBARD, L.M. (\$5 before.)	15,00
" Others,	3,00	21,00	Derry, N. H., John Bradley,	2,00
New Bedford, Cash,	25,00		Boston, THOMAS GAFFIELD, L. M.,	20,00
" C. M. Morgan,	25,00		" Josiah F. Bumstead,	2,00
" Thos. Mandell,	10,00		R. I. Peace Soc'y, (part) by H.	25,00
" D. C. Greene,	10,00		H. Brown,	32,08
" W. W. Swain,	10,00		Publications sold,	
" W. C. Taber,	10,00		Total.	\$845,20
" Philip Anthony,	10,00			
" Geo. Howland, Jr.,	10,00			

TERMS.—Advocate of Peace, monthly, 16 pp; one vol. in two years; \$1.00 in advance.  
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY'S OFFICE, 21 Cornhill, Boston. GEO. C. BECKWITH, Corresponding Secretary; Wm C. Brown, Office Agent.  
POSTAGE. In Mass.  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent a quarter, or 3 cents a year; elsewhere in the U.S. double this